

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademock Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/662,176	09/14/2000	Toshiyuki Yamashita	325772019400	2043
75	90 09/29/2004		EXAMINER	
Barry E. Bretschneider			CUFF, MICHAEL A	
Morrison & Foe 1650 Tysons Bl			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
McLean,, VA			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ه.			£
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/662,176	YAMASHITA ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Cuff	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, in the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. n. a reply within the statutory minimum of this eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	13 July 2004		
	This action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice unclosed.	owance except for formal mat	• •	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-17 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	ndrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	·	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 09/662,176

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okigami in view of Antziopoulos et al.

Okigami shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying numerous transmitters, where data is stored and specifically monitoring operation value compared to life value.

Okigami shows, figure 1, a networked connected device 5 (terminal apparatus, copier) with storage section 11 (first memory), a communications section (controller, see figure 2b), and a network connection. There is a trouble management server 2 (management apparatus) with storage section 21 (second memory).

Antziopoulos et al. teaches, figure 1, a copier system with monitors. In order to change these replacement components individually depending on the particular rated service life (life value), each replacement component is associated with its own level-of-use detector (operating value). See column 3, lines 34-36.

Based on the teaching of Antziopoulos et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Okigami

Application/Control Number: 09/662,176

Art Unit: 3627

system to specifically monitor operation value compared to life value in order to change these replacement components individually.

The examiner takes Official Notice that multiple transmitters can take the place of network connections in order to provide a cheaper and more simple means of data transfer and that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store data in any one of a number of database in order to provide more convenience.

Based on the discussion above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Okigami system to replace the network connections with multiple transmitters in order to provide a cheaper and more simple means of data transfer and to store data in any database in order to provide more convenience.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The new limitation does not read over the prior art of record. The usage of the parts in the copier and the total life history of a particular part, regardless of whether the part has been used in multiple apparatus. As stated in the rejection, Antziopoulos et al. teaches that each replacement component is associated with its own level-of-use detector. Because each component part has its own detector, it meets the metes and bounds of the limitation "regardless of whether the part has been used in multiple apparatus".

Application/Control Number: 09/662,176

Art Unit: 3627

Conclusion

Page 4

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (703) 308-0610. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Cuff

September 27, 2004

aff 9/27/04